THE

CHRISTIAN FREEMAN.

VOL. IV.] MARCH, 1836. [No. XLI.

MILLENARIANISM.

CERTAIN questions create at particular times much popular discussion. Three or four years ago, the Millenarian controversy produced great excitement. Edward Irving was the leader of the agitation. He and other apostles of Millenarianism spread their peculiarities with astonishing zeal. They preached their system as if it constituted the characteristic and engrossing theme of the Bible and of Christianity. To hear them, one would have thought that they had received a patent of inspiration to expound, without a shadow of doubt or of mistake, the unfulfilled prophecies of the mysterious Apocalypse. On those who could not fall in with their scheme, they looked down from the towering heights of their enthusiasm, with contemptuous pity; and those who withstood Millenarian Quixotism, they denounced with most insulting invective, as constituting a part of that great infidel apostacy which should immediately precede the latter day. Thousands caught the contagion. The wildest extravagancies became fashionable. It was a religious disease. The epidemic of fanaticism spread far and wide. The delirium raged, and raved, and maddened through the land.

Now that a religious calm has succeeded, the disciples of Millenarianism will, we hope, be in some measure prepared to weigh, with temper and docility, the arguments which demonstrate the fallacy of their darling system.

The question between us and Millenarians, is not—will there be a Millennium? Both parties hold as certain truth the doctrine of the Millennium. Satan shall be bound a thousand years. The angel of the covenant shall cast him into the bottomless pit, and bind him there. All power on earth will be in the hands of saints. Truth, piety, and peace shall universally prevail. It will be the reign of Christ on earth. When the thousand years are fulfilled, Satan shall be loosed again a

little season. He shall go forth again to deceive the nations. During this dismal period, called the "little season," it will be Satan's reign on earth. It will be time's climax of impiety and wickedness. At this crisis, while the wicked triumph in boldness and security, the Son of God shall personally interpose, and, with the vengeance of eternal fire, sweep them from the earth, and from his presence.

Neither is the question between us and Millenarians—will the Lord Jesus come in person and in glory a second time to our world? He will come. As surely as he came the first time in the flesh of his humiliation to suffer and to atone, so surely will he come the second time in the flesh of his glory, to raise the dead, to judge the world, and to gather to himself everlastingly all his saints—all who have made a covenant with him by sacrifice.

But the grand question in debate between us and Millenarians is—will our Lord's second personal and glorious appearing be at the beginning of the Millennium, or shall it take place after the thousand years of universal piety and peace, and after the "little season" of Satanic impiety and wickedness shall have run their destined course? At the commencement of the Millennium, will there be, as Millenarians say, a first resurrection of the saints and martyrs, and will there be a first visible and general judgment of the nations; and after the thousand years, and after the "little season" have come to a close, shall there be a second resurrection of the dead, and a second general judgment? Or shall one general resurrection and one general judgment at the end of time, terminate the mystery of God on earth, and complete the catastrophe of this world's history? We, as well as Millenarians, hold that Christ will reign with his saints on earth during the thousand years. Millenarians, however, contend that Christ's reign during the Millennium, will be a visible and bodily reign; Jerusalem, say they, will be the seat of his court; and he will establish on earth one vast temporal empire. We, on the contrary, hold, with the great body of the church in all ages, that Christ's reign on earth, during the thousand years, will not be a visible bodily reign, but a reign of grace—a reign in the person of his saints—a reign such as he is now exercising by his spiritual presence in his church, and in the hearts of believers, only amazingly heightened above what it is now; a reign by his Spirit in the hearts of men, stirring them up to a vast productiveness in grace and good works; a great moral reign of truth and righteousness.

Having stated the grand question in debate between us and Millenarians, we now proceed to demonstrate, by several steps of scriptural argument, that the Lord Jesus shall make his glorious appearing, not at the beginning of the Millennium, but at the end of the world.

1. The Scriptures intimate but two bodily comings of our Lord Jesus Christ. His first coming was a coming of abasement and suffering; and it is past. His second coming in glory and in triumph is yet future. "Christ once suffered," says the apostle, "to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." The grand errand of our great High Priest, at his first coming, was to make atonement for sin by the sacrifice of himself. Having made that atonement, he has gone, like the typical high-priest of old, with the blood of sacrifice into the holy of holies, there to plead before the high mercy-seat of heaven the merit of his blood. And as the Jewish high-priest, having offered incense and intercession before the mercy-seat, came forth again to the people, without repeating the sin-offering; in like manner shall our Royal High-Priest come forth again from his rule and intercession in those heavens which now retain him from our sight—come forth from out those interposing heavens to gladden the eyes of his expecting church—come forth in his resurrection body, shining with a brightness brighter than the sun—come forth the second time, but without making a second offering for sin, his one sin-offering being infinitely meritorious—come forth for the salvation and to the adoring joy of his saints—come forth to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe. In so far, Millenarians and we travel together. But here our roads divide.

2. The resurrection of the dead is connected with our Lord's second coming. The apostle, after showing that our Lord's resurrection had secured the resurrection of believers, specifies the time when their resurrection shall take place; "Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's *at his coming*." Now, Millenarians tell us that there will be a first resurrection for the saints at the beginning of the Millennium, and that after the long lapse of the thousand years, a second resurrection will take place for the wicked. So Millenarians say, but what is our Lord's account of the resurrection? Does he say, that there will be a first resurrection of the saints, and then a resurrection for the wicked, with the whole Millennium of an interval? His account is altogether different. "Marvel not at

this," he says, "for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Here our Lord speaks of the resurrection of the good, and the resurrection of the evil. But does he say that there will be two different resurrections, one for the righteous at the beginning, and one for the wicked after the close of the Millennium? No; he speaks of them as one resurrection. He speaks of them as resurrections, not taking place at distinct and distant periods, but as taking place together at one and the same time. Millenarians, in attempting to establish their favourite scheme of two resurrections, with the whole thousand years between, endeavour to press into their service that Scripture, in which John declares, "he saw the *souls* of those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years: this is the first resurrection." This resurrection, however, means that great moral resurrection of the church from her state of religious torpor and death—that amazing revival of religion which shall usher in the thousand years. It is a resurrection of souls—of spirits and of principles—not of bodies that is spoken of. This, therefore, is no proof that Christ will come in person to our world at the beginning of the Millennium. Even suppose, for argument's sake, that a literal resurrection, a resurrection not of *souls*, but of *bodies*, were here meant, it would not be a resurrection of the saints in general, but a resurrection only of the martyrs. A literal resurrection confined to martyrs taking place at the beginning of the Millennium, would be no proof of Christ's glorious appearing at that period, because his glorious appearing is connected essentially with the general resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust. Millenarians attempt also to force a testimony in favour of two resurrections from that passage. "The dead in Christ shall rise first." In this place, however, the apostle is not speaking of the resurrection of "the dead in Christ," as taking place before the resurrection of the dead who are not in Christ. He is not speaking of the resurrection of those who are not dead in Christ at all. He is speaking of the time when the resurrection of the dead in Christ shall take place, in relation to that miraculous instantaneous transformation which shall be wrought on the bodies of those who shall be living on the earth at the coming of our Lord. He shews that at the coming of our Lord, the transformation of the living shall not be effected first, but the resurrection of the

dead shall first be effected, and then the change of the living will take place. Let us quote the whole passage. It bears strongly on our subject. "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain at the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the *dead* in Christ shall rise *first*. *Then—after* the resurrection of the dead—*then*, we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; so shall we ever be with the Lord." Now let us look attentively at this passage. What a cluster of most wonderful truths have we here exhibited. We have, first of all, the time specified, when the amazing transactions, here mentioned, shall take place. The *coming of the Lord.* Then we have our Lord's descent declared:—He shall descend from heaven—he shall descend with a shout—he shall descend with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God. The effect of his descent, is the resurrection of the dead, and the change of the living. Here is the order of these two events:—The dead in Christ shall rise first; then, after their resurrection, the living shall be changed. The dead in their resurrection bodies, and the living in their transfigured bodies, mingling in one vast and rejoicing company, are caught up in the clouds to meet their descending Lord—to attend him to the solemnities of judgment, and to be for ever with the Lord. All these wonderful transactions—the resurrection of the dead—the change of the living—their mingling together—their being for ever with the Lord, are all essentially connected with Christ's second coming. They belong not to the Millennium at all—they belong not to the beginning of it—they belong not to the close of it. They terminate the transactions of time. They wind up the drama of the world. We conclude, therefore, in opposition to the Millenarian theory, that Christ's glorious appearing will be at the end of this world, and not at the beginning of the Millennium.

3. The general judgment, as well as the resurrection, is essentially connected with our Lord's second appearing. The Scriptures fix the time of the judgment. It follows immediately after the resurrection. Both follow our Lord's descent from heaven; and, as mention is made of only one general and simultaneous resurrection, so mention is made of only one general and simultaneous judgment of the righteous and the wicked. "I saw," says John, "a great white throne, and him

that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. And I saw the *dead, small* and *great*, stand before God: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the Book of Life; and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works." What is our Lord's account of his coming, and of the judgment? "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on the right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels! And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Seeing that we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive according to the deeds done in the body, whether they have been good or evil; and seeing that it is a general judgment for all at once, whether righteous or wicked;—the grand question to be decided here, is, does Scripture fix the judgment for the opening of the Millennium, or after its close? The Judge himself tells us, that it will be "*at the end of this world.*" "The harvest," he declares, "is the end of the world—the harvest, when the wheat, the children of the kingdom, shall be gathered to himself—the tares, the children of the wicked one, shall be cast into unquenchable fire. Now, are we to let Millenarians make us imagine that the end of the world is the beginning of the Millennium? Are we to confound time and space, leap at once over the whole thousand years, and put an end to this world, before we allow the Millennium to commence? Are we to break down the world first, and then, when we expect the Millennium to begin, have no world for it to begin on? Such is the absurdity of Millenarianism, and yet this is the system with which so much zeal has been thrown away in attempting to inoculate the faith of the church, and bewilder and turn the brains of men. Now the judgment, and all its transactions, are connected with Christ's coming: Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all. The punishment of the wicked is connected with his coming: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, with his mighty angels,

to take vengeance on them that know not God." The glorification of the righteous is connected with Christ's second coming: "For when he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory; and he shall fashion our vile bodies after the likeness of his own glorious body." Now our argument is this, the judgment closes the present scene of things—but the judgment depends on the second coming of Christ. We, therefore, conclude, in opposition to Millenarianism, that our Lord's second coming will be at the end of the world, and not at the beginning of the Millennium.

4. Christ's second coming will be followed not only by the resurrection and judgment, but by the universal conflagration. "The heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and pass away with a great noise; the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up. Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The question here is, when shall the conflagration take place? Are we to look for the dissolution of all things before the Millennium? Dr. Gill says the conflagration will precede the Millennium; and yet, according to the Millenarian notion, the wicked are to lie in their graves all the time of the thousand years. So we have here the burning up of the dead in their graves previous to their resurrection! Surely the dissolution of all things can only be reasonably expected at the end of time, and not at the beginning of the thousand years. The conflagration of the world is the judicial act of Christ, the Judge of all. To effect this, he shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire. His second advent, therefore, cannot take place at the commencement of the Millennium, but at the close of time.

5. The Scriptures place the resurrection, judgment, and conflagration, at the last day. God has appointed a day in which he will raise the dead and judge the world. This day is called the "*last day*." "I will raise him up at the last day." "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." This last day is literally the last. If another day succeed, it cannot be the last. It is the last in the course of time. All beyond is eternity. Then cometh the end. The thunder of the descending Judge sounds the knell of time. It is the burial of a departed world. The earth is burnt up. All things

are dissolved. Can all this be only the beginning of the Millennium? What! The last day of time the beginning of the Millennium! The end of all things only the beginning of the thousand years!! Millenarianism involves contradictions; and no system involving contradictions can be true.

6. Our Lord's second coming will not only be followed by the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world, and the dissolution of all things, but it will terminate his mediatorial administration, put an end to all Gospel ordinances, and associate the saints for ever with the Lord—a state of things entirely subversive of the notion of Christ's second coming taking place at the beginning of the Millennium. After speaking of the resurrection, the apostle adds—"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Now the question is, are we to suppose that the emphatic *end*, spoken of in this passage, is no more than a pompous method of announcing, not the real end of all things, but merely the advent of the Millennium? Shall Christ have delivered up his mediatorial kingdom to the Father when the Millennium shall commence its course? Will he, during the Millennium, cease to exercise his mediatorial administration? Shall he have put down all rule and authority in this world during the thousand years? All that time, is there to be no government on earth—no rule in church or state? Will the reign of Christ and of his saints on earth be a putting down of all rule and power? Will not death have dominion over those who are in their graves during the Millennium? and can he have completed the delivery of the kingdom to the Father until that last enemy be destroyed in the resurrection by his coming? Will not the coming of the Lord Jesus be in order to put down the Satanic reign of impiety and wickedness of the "little season" succeeding the Millennium? Will not the very end of his appearing be to inflict the vengeance of eternal fire on his church's persecutors?

After the resurrection, the saints shall be for ever with the Lord in glory. The means of grace will then cease. They will have no need of the light of the Bible, or of the Gospel, for they shall see face to face, and in his light they shall see light clearly. Our Sabbaths will be no more; our sermons will be no more; our sacraments no more. All shall be swallowed up and lost in the light of glory. Is this a state of

things for the Millennium, or for heaven? For heaven surely, and not for the Millennium. Are we prepared to abandon, even during the Millennium, our Sabbaths, sermons, and sacraments? Are our means of grace even then to be thrown aside, as so much worn out and needless scaffolding? Millenarians themselves must shrink back from such consequences. Yet such consequences certainly follow their system. Now we know from Scripture that the means of grace shall cease only with our Lord's second coming. Of the Lord's Supper it is said—"As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death *till he come.*" Of the ordinance of preaching, Christ says—"Go ye and teach all nations; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the *end of the world.*" As Christ's coming will be at the end of the world, we conclude that Gospel ordinances shall be observed, as by saints now, during the Millennium, attended, however, by an outpouring of the Spirit, and a revival of religion, which will be "as *life from the dead.*" Christ's coming, we conclude, therefore, will not be at the commencement, but after the close of the Millennium.

Millenarianism has, indeed, been advocated by several great men, and many at times have embraced it. Its manifest opposition, however, to the tenor of Scripture, must prevent it from ever becoming general. Lately, the eccentricities and extravagancies of its advocates have brought it into disrepute. Their doctrine of universal pardon—their preaching up the revival of the old sacrifices at Jerusalem—their pretensions to the gift of tongues and miracles—their maintaining that Antichrist is not yet come, and that none of the prophecies of the book of Revelation have yet been fulfilled, have led sober minds to shrink from a system, propagated by men who taught such doctrines with as much earnestness as if they involved the redemption of mankind.

One grand mistake of Millenarians, arises, we conceive, from confounding that happy order of things which shall take place on earth during the Millennium, with that happy order of things which shall take place on earth after the dissolution of the present system of things. The earth shall be burned with fire; but it is the property of fire to dissolve, not to annihilate. Out of the ashes of the old world shall arise a *Phœnix* world, in comparison of which, even the garden of Eden itself was but a wilderness. "According to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The Millennium will, indeed, be a "restitution of all things," but it will not be that eminent and emphatic restitution of all things consequent

on Christ's coming at the the last day; as it is written—"Whom the heaven must *receive until* the times of restitution of all things." The Millennium will not free the earth completely from wickedness, and the Millennium itself will come to an end. Satan shall be loosed; wickedness and impiety shall reign; infidel persecution shall assail the saints of Jesus; Gog and Magog, with their multitudinous host, shall compass the camp of the saints and the beloved city. At this crisis the glorious Redeemer personally interposes. He descends from heaven with a shout of triumph: with the vengeance of fire he sweeps away the wicked; and burns and purges this earth which was the the theatre of their crimes. As the flood of devouring water, in the days of Noah, purged, but did not annihilate the earth, the flood of still more devouring fire shall not annihilate, but purge and renovate the earth at the coming of the Son of Man. Out of the ashes of the old world spring a "new heavens and a new earth." Here sin ceases for ever. Here righteousness dwells without end; the sunlight of this happy world never knows a cloud or a close; and the devil, the deceiver and destroyer, is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone for ever and ever. LUTHER.

WISDOM.

"A good man will guide his affairs with discretion."—Ps cxii. 5.

THE benevolent justly complain that they are often called on to relieve improvident persons, who, by the proper exercise of foresight and economy, might have made a reasonable provision against the casualties of life; but who, in consequence of the habit of living up to their means, are reduced to the extreme of destitution, when overtaken by sickness or old age.

Improvidence is a great evil, and one which particularly prevails among the working classes. Few comparatively make provision for the future. Instead of laying up something in reserve for the evil day, multitudes are satisfied with providing for the wants of the day that passes over them. Should their means be more abundant at some seasons than others, the increase of their prosperity is only an increase of their indulgence. They live, according to the common saying, from hand to mouth: they have nothing laid up for casualties—nothing for extra demands; and when sickness comes, their earnings being cut off,

they are plunged into distress, and are thrown upon the compassion of their more prosperous and more provident brethren.

Others again, from habitual mismanagement, are unable to keep up with the demands of the day. Suppose their wages paid weekly, they contrive to be at least a week's wages in debt for their household necessaries. They entangle themselves in multiplied and growing embarrassments. They run accounts with this and the other shopkeeper and dealer. They go into debt to all they can get to trust them. When driven off by one, they try to impose on another. Beset with difficulties, they have recourse to all manner of shifts and stratagems. Dissimulation, lying, and fraud, are forced on them by a kind of shocking necessity. Every day they are forced to renew the combat with embarrassments which, by their improvidence, they entail on themselves; and they thus doom themselves for life to wade through self-created distresses.

Those who live by their labour are a large and important portion of Society. They constitute the great mass of the people. In proportion as they are prosperous, wise, and virtuous, in proportion is the nation physically and morally strong. Anxious for the happiness of such a class, I wish to expostulate with them. Many of you make no provision for the future. Is this wise or right? Is it consistent with your duty to yourselves or to your neighbour? When thrown out of employment, and reduced to distress, to have recourse to the aid of others is undoubtedly necessary. In such circumstances, it is as certainly our duty to receive aid, as, in different circumstances, it is our duty to impart it. Is it not an inquiry, however, which we should institute—whether is our distress purely providential, or is it the fruit of our own folly, improvidence, or vice? When a man has recourse to the funds of another, let him reason with himself—"I am putting myself on his gettings and his savings; why have I not gettings and savings of my own? I am drawing on his money. Money is the representative of property; property is the accumulation of savings; savings are the result of labour, industry, and economy; and if my poverty is the consequence of my neglect, my extravagance, or my luxury, is it either honest or honourable in me now to quarter myself upon the bounty of the industrious? I read my sin in my punishment."

Unless we establish a habit, under Providence, of laying up in store against the risks and emergencies of the future, to what evils and moral dangers do we expose ourselves! We are liable to accidents. We are subject to diseases. Should we live

to old age, we must become unfitted in mind and body for the activities of our respective callings. Should we be cut off in the vigour of our days, we may leave a widow and fatherless children behind us. With these considerations before us, are we justified in spending, week by week, and year by year, the whole of our earnings or our income? Is this consistent with independence? Is it dealing fairly by those who, by the law of God and of our country, are dependent on us for their maintenance, education, and outfit in life? Are we keeping ourselves free from the embarrassments and the dependance which break the spirit, and destroy that noble sense of honour and dignity, which cannot be kept too sacred from the touch of profanation? Are we taking proper precautions against those complicated necessities which may reduce us to have recourse to those mean and dishonest shifts, with regard to which, many a man, who has fallen into them, once lifted his hands in astonishment how any one could be guilty of such acts, saying, with Hazael in the Scripture, "Am I a dog, that I should do such things?" When possibilities of immorality are before us, which would lead us to forfeit our virtue and our peace, cut us off from the church, sweep us and our children away before the current of an evil world, and endanger both our salvation and theirs, what is our wisdom, and what is our duty? Surely it is to consider ourselves, lest we also be tempted.

In enforcing the wisdom of providing of this world's good against the contingencies of the future, it is necessary to guard against weakening that filial and prayerful dependance which we should habitually cherish in the providence of our heavenly Father. The good things of this life are his gift. Our Saviour commands us to take no thought for what we shall eat, what we shall drink, or wherewithal we shall be clothed. He who feeds the birds, and clothes the flowers of the field, will not leave man, and especially his children, unprovided.

The freedom from anxiety and care enjoined by our Lord, is completely consistent with that provident concern for the future, which we are recommending. When Christ says, "Take no thought for to-morrow," his meaning is not, that we are to banish every kind and degree of thought from our minds, but only that undue solicitude for the future, which we distinguish by the emphatic word—"*care*," a disease of mind which springs from unbelief, and which is destructive of our happiness. When the Scripture says, "Be careful for nothing," we are to understand it as prohibiting this sinful care, but not that proper attention which it is necessary to give

to our worldly business. When it is said, "Be content with such things as ye have," contentment by no means implies that we are to lie down in a state of passivity, without making any exertion to better our condition in the world. This were criminal sloth, and not virtuous contentment.

That these principles of interpretation are correct, will appear evident from that injunction of our Lord—"Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life." Common sense tells us at once, that our Lord cannot mean that we are not to labour at all for our daily bread. Were this the case, then the farmer must drop his farm, the merchant his trade; the business of life must at once stand still; the human race must perish of hunger, and the religion of Christ would be a religion of starvation. Our Lord's meaning is sufficiently obvious. Our eternal happiness is to be preferred to all earthly good, and all our employments and pursuits in this life are to be subordinated to the soul's salvation.

On this, as well as all other subjects, we are not to confine ourselves to partial quotations, but must compare Scripture with Scripture. While it is said, "Be careful for nothing," it is also said, "If any man provide not for his own, especially those of his own household, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." Providing for our own, surely includes making all lawful and reasonable endeavours to have the command of means, not only of giving lodging, food, and raiment, to those who depend on us for subsistence, but of giving them education, placing them under the Gospel, and giving them an outfit in life suited to our circumstances. Can this be done where there is indolence, improvidence, or waste? Can this be done without diligence, industry, and economy? Industry and economy, we see clearly, must rank among the Christian virtues.

"He that will not work," says the Scripture, "let him not eat." Indolence is here condemned. But where is the use of activity and exertion, if the wages of our labour be expended unprofitably? Should we earn ever so much, what does it profit us, unless we husband it with care, and apply with it wisdom? "He that is slothful in his work, is brother to him that is a great waster." Let the sluggard dread the earthly ills he entails on himself. If thou wilt not awake, O sluggard, out of thy dreamy sleep of sloth, thy "poverty shall come as one that travelleth, and thy want as an armed man." Diligence in our calling is, therefore, clearly our duty.

While it is our duty to be diligent in business, we are not

at liberty to spend what we do spend entirely on ourselves. We are to honour the Lord with our substance. Religion is to be supported and extended. This cannot be done without the free-will offerings of Christians. The poor must have a portion; and to communicate to their necessities, is as clearly our duty as to provide for ourselves. The good man will lend, and he will give, as the urgencies of his brethren require; but how can this possibly be done, if we consume all we have upon ourselves?

He must be poor, indeed, whom the law of Christ exempts from giving according to his means. We know how he extolled the poor widow, who cast her mite into the treasury, and a cup of cold water given to a disciple, shall not be without its reward. "Let him," says the apostle, "who stole, steal no more, but rather let him labour, working with his hands, that he may have to give to him that needeth." What a motive to industry! To give to him that needeth. Even he that works with his hands is required to give. His earnings are small; still he is required to give. But how shall he give, unless he have something to give? And how shall he have any thing to give, unless he husband and save the little that he has? *We should save all we can.*

It is not enough to consider the best method of *saving;* we must consider also the best method of *gaining.* We should make the most of our occupation. Multitudes, even of the hard and worldly, overlook this. How many tradesmen are there who are provokingly bad in their several callings? This arises principally from want of mental energy, and from an indolent habit. How many farmers are there who never exert themselves to the better cultivation of their grounds. Whatever we have to do, we should do it in the best manner. Whatever our business is, we should turn it to the best account. "He," says Swift, "who makes two blades of grass grow, where one only grew before, is a benefactor to his country." Yes; and what will weigh with us more, he is a benefactor to himself. We should exercise and inform our minds, as to the best manner of practising our several callings; and, we may depend upon it, that we shall receive ample profits upon our capital. *We should make all we can.*

Certainly the law of God allows us "to enjoy the fruit of our own labour under the sun." But there must be no excess — no waste. This world's good is a talent for which we must account at the last. And in the great day, we shall find, that the little which the poor man has *made,* and has *saved,* and

has *laid out* on works of necessity and mercy, will be infinitely better than the vast revenues which the rich and powerful first extort from the poor, and then lavish on their lusts.

We should doubtless be wise for the soul and wise for eternity. Where this is wanting, wisdom, in relation to every thing else, is madness and folly. But why not be wise in relation to this life, as well as that which is to come? Why not be wise in regard to our worldly business, as well as our religious interests? It is mischievous to separate business from religion. Religion should direct our business and all our pursuits. And is wisdom no part of religion? It is a very essential and prominent part of it. Wisdom, in fact, should guide all our worldly management. It should preside in our household. It should direct our heads in planning, and our hands in performing. Wisdom should mark all our actions. We should aspire to be known and commended as wise men. Let us, therefore, have that maxim of inspired wisdom stamped on our minds as the guide of our conduct, "A good man will order his affairs with discretion."

LUTHER.

A VIEW OF CHARLES I.

CHARLES I., our readers are aware, was dethroned by the Long Parliament, and was then beheaded by a party, who, having command of the army, raised itself superior to both king and parliament. Cromwell's death was followed by the restoration of Charles II. With the restoration arose to power that party which had been prostrated by the civil wars. Episcopacy was all along the darling system of that party; and hence, when they found themselves again in power, they not only re-established Episcopacy, but retaliated, by measures of the greatest severity, upon their opponents, the Presbyterians and Independents. Hence the infamous Bartholomew act, by which two thousand ministers were in one day ejected from their parishes, and from their means of subsistence, for nonconformity. The Established Church of England has ever since cherished, as might naturally be expected, a great veneration for the memory of Charles I., whom she regards as having bound up the cause of Episcopacy with his throne and with his life, and as having fallen in sustaining its domination and establishment. Not content, however, with endeavouring to maintain an immortal memory for Charles I., she has absolutely

endeavoured to raise him to the rank of a martyr. She has instituted a religious service, and set apart a particular day every year, the 30th of January, in honour of "Charles the Martyr." Any one looking into the prayer-book, will see this. There she calls him a martyr: in a set form of prayer, by direct address to the Deity, she calls him "martyr," "blessed martyr," "thy blessed martyr, Charles I.," and in the service appointed for the day, she recites Scriptures which speak of the sufferings and death of our blessed Redeemer! Not to enter on the profanity of such a parallelism—not to speak of the Popery of setting apart a day, and appropriating a religious service in honour of a dead man—there are certain historical facts, the consideration of which should now abate all men's veneration for Charles, and, in the estimation of posterity, dethrone him from the liturgy, and from martyr's honours, as he was once dethroned from regal power.

The historical facts to which I allude are beyond question, for they are supported by the authority of Charles's own letters.

The following is a letter from Charles I., addressed to Lord Digby—"I am endeavouring to get to London, being not without hope, that I shall be able to draw either the Presbyterians or the Independents to side with me in *extirpating one the other*, that I shall be king again. I will conclude with this assurance, that whatever may become of me, by the *grace of God*, I will never forsake the *church*, my friends, or the crown."

What a document have we here! What a view does it open into this man's heart! Behold this *paternal* sovereign—this kingly *confessor*—this *royal martyr*, after deluging England with the best blood of her sons, planning the *extirpation*—his own language—the extirpation of one religious denomination of his subjects, by the instrumentality of another. He does not care which, provided he be able, as he says, to *draw* one or other to side with him. If he be able to draw one of them to side with him, he will *extirpate* the other. This is no metaphysical extirpation—no extirpation of men's opinions from their minds, but of their persons from the earth. He will shed their blood. Here is a martyr for you! Truly he is a man well qualified to make martyrs. He who could use such language, and plot such a scheme, was in heart a *persecutor;* not a martyr, but a *martyr-maker*. Yet this man who is coolly plotting the extirpation of either the Presbyterians or the Independents by the help of the other, talks in the very same breath of the *grace of God*, and vows that he will never for-

sake the church. Such a man's saying so, is no proof of sincerity. At all events, they must have been strange notions of the church and of the grace of God, which such a mind and such a heart was capable of entertaining. The attachment which he professed for the church was likely much of the same stamp as the friendship which he professed for the liberties of the people—a profession of attachment to cover over his secret and darling purpose of establishing arbitrary power. A little before his death, he made this solemn profession—"He did never intend to encroach on the privileges of parliament, and was as much a *friend* to the liberty and freedom of the people as any one." Was he, indeed? Not encroach on the privileges of parliament, after he had attempted to rule without parliaments altogether! He as much a friend to the freedom of the people as any one, after having goaded them to madness by his oppressions, so that they and parliament, after a bloody and protracted civil war, drove him from the throne!

Having had a specimen of Charles's administration in England, let us take a view of his conduct, with regard to Scotland. Here, as in the former case, I take, as my sure authority, a letter of Charles himself. In a letter to the Marquis of Hamilton, bearing date the 17th of June, 1638, he says—"I expect not any thing can reduce that people to obedience, but *force* only: in the meantime, your care must be how to dissolve the multitude; and to this end, I give you leave to *flatter* them with *what hopes* you please, your chief end being now to win time until *I be ready to suppress them.*" Why, what evil had the Scotch done? They were guilty of the unpardonable sin of choosing for themselves in matters of religion, instead of receiving the prelatic bishops and Popish liturgy which Charles and Laud, in their sovereign wisdom and infallibility had been at the trouble to make for them! The Scotch had the presumption and impiety to reject Charles's claim to supremacy and headship over the church, foolishly conceiving, that if the Pope, a clergyman, had been dispossessed of this, the king of England, a layman, had no pretensions to it. Yea, they had the temerity, the impiety, and the wrong-headed obstinacy (in *Charles's opinion*) to assert, even unto the loss of goods, liberty, and life, that the Lord Jesus being much better qualified than any king of England to be Head of his own church, therefore they should own HIM only to be Head. Charles they owned as their king. He had no complaint, with regard to their loyalty. They were a peaceable people. But what of all this, so long as they did not own him to be

lord of their conscience? They would not take him for the head of the church, and, therefore, he must prepare his instruments of vengeance! He says, nothing but *force* can reduce them to obedience; therefore, force shall not be spared. But he is not at present "ready to *suppress* them;" therefore, to gain time, the tyrant says to his venal slave, "I give you leave to *flatter* them with what *hopes* you please." Wheedle them—cajole them—tell them what lies you please—make them believe that, by the grace of God, I will never desert their church, and that I am as great a friend to their civil and religious liberties as any one; only let me get time to raise an army, that I may come down on them, and effect, by the all-silencing arguments of ball and bayonet, their conversion or extirpation. What a paternal sovereign! What a friend to freedom!! What a glorious head of the church!! What a royal martyr!!!

Having viewed the conduct of Charles I., in relation to England and Scotland, let us now view his conduct in relation to Ireland. To Ireland it cannot be presumed to be of happier effects—Ireland, which has ever been a proverb of calamity—the chosen victim of misgovernment and oppression. Charles I. not only was a participant, but a primary instigator of that insurrection in Ireland, which once breaking out, terminated in the horrible massacre of 1641. This is now an established historical fact. If any reader wish to see this set forth at length, let him consult Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church, page 301—306. The Protestants, then in possession of power in Ireland, were generally of the Puritan party, and would, therefore, naturally side with their brethren and the Parliament in England, then contending against the arbitrary and unconstitutional rule of Charles. To disable the Irish Protestants from making common cause with the English Puritans, Charles issued a commission, dated at Edinburgh, the first of October, 1641, empowering the Irish leaders, who were Roman Catholics, to seize in his name the chief places of strength, and to disarm and arrest the Irish Protestants. This was acted on. The massacre of 1641 was the consequence. Protestants shudder with horror at the remembrance of 1641. 45,000 Protestants were murdered in cold blood. Yet there are Protestants who regard Charles as the "royal martyr!" It must surely be from want of knowledge of history that any can henceforth continue to do so. Charles, we grant, did not probably contemplate so horrible a result as the massacre which took place. But in issuing his commission to the Irish Catholic leaders, he could hardly expect but that *Protestant blood* should be shed!

To suppress the Covenanters in Scotland, he tells us that he must use *force*. He was determined to employ *force*, also, to suppress the friends of civil and religious liberty in Ireland. Now will any man pretend to say, that in such a case, force could be applied without blood flowing, and without blood being intended? We shall suppose that a tyrannical landlord has a tenant who stands upon his rights. Such a tenant is troublesome to an arbitrary landlord, and besides is a dangerous example to others. How shall the landlord dispose of him? He secretly hires an incendiary to fire him out. The incendiary in the night time sets fire to the honest man's dwelling, and not only burns the house, but burns him and his whole family to death. But the fire does not stop there. It seizes upon the surrounding houses, lays the whole town in ashes, and thousands of lives are sacrificed! Is it much of an apology for the tyrant to say, that he did not think that the town should be destroyed, or that any lives should be lost, but that he only originally intended burning out one family?

Charles I. was a savage tyrant—a bloody persecutor! Let us hear no more of the "royal martyr!"

LUTHER.

THE EARNEST INQUIRER AFTER SALVATION DIRECTED,

In a Conversation with his Minister.

Inquirer.—You have often been so good as to invite the members of your flock to lay their cases before you in private; and I have at length ventured to come and ask your counsel in reference to an uneasiness of mind which I have felt for some time past.

Minister.—I am glad to see you, my dear friend, especially as you have come on such an errand. He is a happy minister who receives such visits daily. What is the uneasiness of mind of which you complain?

Inq.—My conscience tells me that I am not at peace with God; and that were I called away in my present state I would be lost for ever.

Min.—It is no wonder then that you are uneasy; but let us examine the matter a little—do you really feel that you are a sinner?

Inq.—O, Yes! I certainly do. I feel that I am a great—a very great sinner! That is the cause of my distress.

Min.—But are you not assured that Christ came into the world to save sinners?

Inq.—I have no doubt of it—"It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance."

Min.—I wish you could heartily enter into the spirit of that statement; but, at all events, you are persuaded of the fact of the Saviour's atonement. Now do you feel that in virtue of that atonement God is making to you a gracious proposal of mercy?

Inq.—I hope so.

Min.—But are you not *sure* of it? Are you not told that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Inq.—That is all true; but still I fear that there is no mercy for me. O, Sir, if you knew what a sinner I have been!

Min.—I know it all; you have been a sinner infinitely more wicked than either you or I can have any idea of; but is not the word "whosoever" as wide as you could wish? Does it not include you? Does it not even single you out, and address to you personally a free offer of salvation? And if the passage I have quoted does not satisfy you, cannot you easily quote multitudes besides, in which God entreats the very chief of sinners to turn and live?

Inq.—But I cannot help fearing after all that *I* would not be welcome.

Min.—Now, my dear friend, just look at what you have said. God declares that you *are* welcome; that if you come to him in the name of Jesus, he "will in no wise cast you out;" but you charge him with insincerity, and suspect his word. Is not this a greater sin than any of those which have so much alarmed you?

Inq.—But I am so unworthy!

Min.—O then, I see how it is: you are looking for some worthiness in yourself, to make you more acceptable to God than you would otherwise be, and because you cannot discover such worthiness to recommend you, you are afraid that God is unwilling to receive you.

Inq.—I have always abhorred self-righteous doctrine, but what you have said leads me to fear that I still possess a *self-righteous spirit.*

Min.—I am glad that you have at length discovered the

root of the evil. And now, my dear friend, mark what I say —you must have a worthiness with which to approach before God; you have none of your own, none whatever, but Jesus by his obedience unto death, has wrought out a worthiness for those that believe, and he offers it freely to you; come to the throne of grace in his worthiness, and in his alone; make it your only plea, while as an humble penitent you implore forgiveness and acceptance, and you may rest assured that, although God will have no respect to you, he will have respect to the sacrifice of his Son, and receive you graciously for his sake. I hope you understand this.

Inq.—I think I do; but how may I be sure that I am at liberty to plead the worthiness of Christ as if it were my own? Is not this something like presumption?

Min.—It would certainly be presumption if God had not commanded it; but he permits and encourages you to come before him, making use of the Saviour's name, presenting his righteousness, and, I might almost add, clothed with his authority. This is the way which he has appointed for your return to his favour, and is not that a sufficient warrant for your adopting it?

Inq.—Most certainly it is! and I think I now see clearly what I must do to be saved. I must not strive to make myself better, by way of recommending myself to God's favour—that was where I was wrong.

Min.—And *that* was what kept you in fear and anxiety. But blessed be God, we do not need to "go about to establish our own righteousness," for the purpose of catching the approving smile of heaven.

Inq.—No; for a better righteousness has been wrought out by the doing and dying of Jesus.

Min.—And that righteousness is offered in the Gospel to be laid hold upon and pleaded by sinners.

Inq.—So that I, as a sinner, am warranted to lay hold upon it and plead it—I feel this now.

Min.—Then, my friend, come in this manner to God through Christ immediately, renounce all pleas and hopes of your own, and cast yourself "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked" at the foot of the cross. Make use of Jesus' name, that name which is above every name; make mention of his righteousness, even of his only, and thus the burden of your sins and your anxieties will fall from your shoulders, and you will enjoy the peace that passeth understanding.

Inq.—Yes; for God will regard Christ's worthiness as mine, and "being thus justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." I now see the whole subject more clearly than ever!

Min.—How glad I am that our conversation has been useful. May God by his Holy Spirit now draw you to himself through Jesus Christ.

ARCHIPPUS.

THE CHRISTIAN WARRIOR TRIUMPHANT IN DEATH.

"SERVANT of God! well done;
Rest from thy loved employ;
The battle fought, the victory won,
Enter thy Master's joy."
The voice at midnight came;
He started up to hear,
A mortal arrow pierced his frame;
He fell—but felt no fear.

Tranquil amidst alarms,
It found him in the field,
A veteran slumbering on his arms,
Beneath his red-cross shield:
His sword was in his hand,
Still warm with recent fight;
Ready that moment, at command,
Through rock and steel to smite.

It was a two-edged blade,
Of heavenly temper keen;
And double were the wounds it made,
Where'er it smote between:
'Twas death to sin—'twas life
To all that mourn'd for sin;
It kindled, and it silenced, strife,
Made war, and peace, within.

Oft with its fiery force,
His arm had quell'd the foe,
And laid, resistless in his course,
The alien-armies low.
Bent on such glorious toils,
The world to him was loss;
Yet all his trophies, all his spoils,
He hung upon the cross.

At midnight came the cry,
"To meet thy God prepare!"
He woke—and caught his Captain's eye;
Then, strong in faith and prayer,

His spirit, with a bound,
Burst its encumbering clay,
His tent, at sunrise, on the ground,
A darkened ruin lay.

The pains of death are past,
Labour and sorrow cease,
And, life's long warfare closed at last,
His soul is found in peace.
Soldier of Christ! well done;
Praise be thy new employ;
And while eternal ages run,
Rest in thy Saviour's joy.

MONTGOMERY.

REVIEW OF MR. DICKEY'S SERMONS.

Sermons on Important Doctrinal and Practical Subjects. By the Rev. William Dickey, Carnone.

THIS volume comes from the pen of an experienced and eminently devoted minister, who has been long admired in his own neighbourhood, as one who,

"Has practised what he preached."

Endowed by the Most High with a becoming modesty, delicate sensibility, cheerful gravity, and childlike simplicity, he possesses vast advantages for winning the affections of young and old, rich and poor. These amiabilities have, doubtless, contributed to produce that extensive catalogue of subscribers' names, which encouraged our author to publish the present work; and we hope, that, through the blessing of God, the same causes will promote its usefulness. Who, that knows any thing of "the inner man," can doubt, that when we are confident a preacher is "speaking the truth in love," our prejudices are disarmed, and our spiritual appetite increased?

For this kindly feeling, Mr. Dickey has good credit with many Unitarians and Roman Catholics, as well as others of different denominations, whose tenets more nearly approach the truth. We may, therefore, hope, that some of these will profit by the manly exposure of their errors, contained in these sermons. Nor should we be less anxious for the salvation of those who profess attachment to the glorious doctrines of the Gospel, here explained and defended, while their temper and

conduct give sad evidence that they are not themselves evangelized. These are here instructed, that "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his," that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," that "the people of Christ crucify the flesh, with its affections and lusts," and that "without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." For this holiness, as well as pardon and acceptance, the sinner is here entreated and commanded, in the name of the Lord, to fly unto Jesus, who is able and willing to "save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him."

These discourses, however, may perhaps be best adapted to edify a class more noble than any yet mentioned, even those whom the Holy Spirit has enlightened to understand and admire the high and holy doctrines embraced by the author; whose faith and hope rest wholly upon God, in Christ, reconciling their souls to himself; and whose temper and habits adorn the doctrines they profess. Such may derive both pleasure and profit from reading an experienced divine's illustration, defence, and application of that precious truth which humbles their souls, exalts their Saviour, purifies their hearts, and glorifies their God. From these discourses, we could easily furnish many pleasing specimens of Scriptural illustration, pathetic appeals to the conscience, and sublime displays of the Christian's present privileges and future prospects. Some of these we may afterwards present to our readers. At present, we recommend them to buy the book itself. It contains nineteen sermons, in a volume of 348 pages, closely but neatly printed, and is sold at the small price of 4s. 6d.

From our friends in the Established Church, we cannot withhold the testimony given by the late Archbishop Magee, to a small volume of sermons, formerly published by this modest but talented and venerable Secession minister. He disposed of a great many copies; and, in recommending it to his friends, unhesitatingly declared, that "he had met with no book in the English language which came up so fully to his ideas of perfection." This was no small commendation from a divine of such research as Dr. Magee, whose learned work on the Atonement, is a standing monument of his fame.

WHAT WAS PAUL'S THORN IN THE FLESH?

"There was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure."—2 Cor. xii. 7.

PAUL was a man greatly favoured. Abundant revelations were made to him. He was caught up to the third heaven. How he was caught up, whether in the body or out of the body, he could not tell. Nor could he tell what he saw or heard there. He heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. To describe what he heard there, he was forbidden and unable. It is not possible to translate into mortal speech the words of heaven; they are *unspeakable* words. Nor was it the will of God that any revelation of them should be made: the words he heard, "it is not *lawful* for a man to utter."

The highest degree of perfection on this side heaven, is incomplete. From the very abundance of the revelations made to him, Paul was exposed to danger. He was in danger of being tempted to sin. The sin to which he was in danger of being tempted, was pride—"exalted above measure." The Lord, however, did not permit his servant to fall into this great sin. Paul was prevented from yielding to this temptation; not by a miracle, but by the application of means. What this means was, is the question especially before us. Paul does not tell us the name of what the means was, but he describes it in figurative terms: "There was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." What was this?

Now, be it observed, the thorn in the flesh, and the messenger of Satan, are two different phrases, which describe the same thing. Whatever it actually was, the mode in which it operated upon him was, "to buffet him;" and the moral effect designed by it was "lest he should be exalted above measure."

Some suppose "the thorn in the flesh—the messenger of Satan," means some sin to which Satan tempted Paul. This, however, cannot be the meaning, for two reasons. First, because, whatever it was, it was of the Lord. It was *given* me, says he. Now, no sin is of the Lord. "God is not tempted to sin, neither tempteth he any man." Secondly, we are sure that the thorn in the flesh cannot mean any sin, because the apostle tells us in the context, that he took "pleasure" in it,

and "gloried" in it. And Paul was not the man to take pleasure or to glory in sin.

By the thorn in the flesh, we understand some afflictive bodily disease. This afflictive bodily disease is called a *thorn*, from its painfulness; called a thorn in the *flesh*, because it affected the body; and called the messenger of Satan, because the Lord may have permitted Satan in this case, as he did formerly in the case of Job, to be the executioner to inflict it; or if Satan did not inflict the bodily disease, perhaps he turned it to the apostle's disadvantage as a preacher of the Gospel, by tempting his hearers to despise him.

Having thus seen that the "thorn in the flesh" was most probably a painful bodily disease, with which Paul was afflicted, we now advance to inquire, what was that particular disease? Paul does not tell us what it was. We do not pretend to determine what it was with certainty; but, by turning to other passages, we may arrive at a highly probable conjecture.

This bodily disease is evidently the same with what Paul calls his *infirmities*—his *weakness*, in the context. The Lord makes him this promise, "My strength is perfect in *weakness*." Paul adds, "Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my *infirmities;* for when I am *weak*, then am I strong." This *weakness* I understand to be literal bodily weakness; and these infirmities, literal bodily infirmities.

This bodily weakness and infirmity, I conceive, to have been *produced by the extraordinary agitation and excitement of his mind, arising from the visions and revelations* vouchsafed to him.

What, for example, was the effect which the astonishing visions and revelations, vouchsafed to Daniel, produced not only on the mind, but on the very body of that greatly favoured prophet? Look at the book of Daniel, seventh chapter, and twenty-eighth verse, and then at the last verse of the eighth chapter, "As for me, Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me, but I kept the matter in my heart. And I, Daniel, fainted, and was sick certain days: afterwards I rose up, and did the king's business, and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." Such, even in the highest and holiest, is the effect on mortal flesh, of those supernatural communications, which the Lord denies the ordinary class even of his beloved children. The mind unknown affects the body, as well as the body affects the mind. Mental agitation, we know from experience, affects the nervous system, and causes bodily disease. So it was with Daniel,

The visions shown him by God wonderfully affected his body as well as his mind—and they affected him in consequence of the action which mind exerts on body. He *fainted*, and was *sick certain days*, and was unable for some time to execute the business of his office. Not only did his cogitations much trouble his mind, but his very *countenance* was changed.

What was the effect which the vision of the glorious Redeemer had on John, though he had been the disciple whom Jesus loved? It not only alarmed his mind, but paralysed his whole bodily frame. "I fell," saye he, "at his feet as dead."

Now, compare the effects of the visions of Daniel and of John upon their bodies, and may we not probably infer that Paul's bodily infirmities, whatever they were, were caused by that mental absorption and excitement produced by the unutterable visions and revelations of the third heaven?

Understanding Paul's bodily disease to be what he calls *infirmities*, and supposing them bodily infirmities to be caused by the effect of visions and revelations on his mind, can we arrive at any probable conclusion what these infirmities were? In order to do this, let us consult three passages in which Paul speaks of himself and of his bodily infirmities.

Addressing the Galatians, chapter iv. 13, 14, he says, "Ye know how, through the infirmity of the flesh, I preached the Gospel to you at first, and my temptation which was in my *flesh*, ye despised not nor rejected, but received me as an angel of God." Here he speaks distinctly of bodily infirmity. It was in the *flesh*. The infirmity was something outward, affecting his appearance and his speech as a public preacher; and the Galatians he commends, not for despising his preaching on that account. Was not this infirmity the thorn in the flesh which kept him humble?

Let us next turn to 2 Cor. x. 10, alluding to those who calumniated him in his absence. "His letters," say they, "are weighty and powerful, but his *bodily* presence is *weak*, and his *speech contemptible*." Paul was a man of powerful eloquence, but at this period of his life he must have been afflicted with some bodily ailment which, affecting his looks, speech and gestures, greatly injured his appearance and his utterance. To those who preferred manner to matter, and "talked of eloquence and not of sacred truth," it was an unpardonable defect—a defect on which they *largely exercised* their scurrilous tongues.

With these passages, connect 1 Cor. ii. 3, "I was with you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling"—bodily weakness, and bodily as well as mental trembling.

From a comparison of the Scriptures adverted to, I am of opinion, that Paul's infirmity—his thorn in the flesh—was a nervous or paralytic affection. This paralytic or nervous affection, I conceive, was the consequence of visions and revelations acting on a susceptible mind, and, through a susceptible mind, on his nervous system. This weakened his frame; it caused a tremour in his voice; it made his head and hands shake; and by affecting his appearance, action, and utterance, greatly impaired his matchless eloquence. This was a great trial to Paul. He would, at first, naturally think that it would impede the success of his preaching; hence, he "besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from him." On account of this, his enemies affected to despise and ridicule him. Its continuance, as it kept him humble, turned out to his salvation. And the thousands who owed their salvation to his preaching, gave the glory to God, because they saw, from his bodily infirmity, that the power was of God and not of man.

LUTHER.

SCRAPS.

"A thing of shreds and patches."

Man versus *Money*.—An Athenian, who was hesitating whether to give his daughter in marriage to a man of worth, with a small fortune, or to a rich man, who had no recommendation but his wealth, consulted Themistocles on the subject. "I would bestow my daughter," said Themistocles, "upon a man without money, rather than upon money without a man."

The Heathens' Idea of Sacrifice.—Ellis, in his Polynesian Researches, informs us, that the heathen inhabitants of Tahiti, called sacrifice, *Taraehara*, a word signifying, *untying from guilt*, being compounded of *tara*, to untie, and *hara*, guilt. This not only shows us the view which the heathen themselves entertain of sacrifice, but helps us to see how sin is taken away by the sacrifice of Christ.

The Power of Oral Eloquence.—The living voice, the kindling eye, the sympathetic cord, struck and thrilling through the hearts of assembled men, are worth volumes of sober argument, and cart-loads of dry discussion.—*Tait's Magazine.*

Severity of the Language of Reform.—The language of reform is always severe—unavoidably severe; and simply be-

cause crime has grown monstrous, and endurance is no longer possible. After reform has been effected, then all agree that no terms can be too strong against the corruption or the oppression which has been put down. Will any man now, with a character to lose, stand up to defend negro slavery, Irish tithes, or the whiskey-drinking customs of society?

Heathen Sects Persecuting.—The assertion is untrue, that no religion persecutes but the Christian; for here (in Trincomalee) the enmity between sects is great as possibly can be. One day the Lascars made a procession in honour of their religion; but as they went beyond their lines, the Malays united and attacked them.—*Life of Alex. Alexander*, p. 138.

Want of Religion.—I am sorry, but truth compels me, to say, that the European soldiers, men and officers, were the only human beings who had no appearance of religion about them, nor any fear of a future state.—*Ibid.*

Education of Deaf and Dumb.—In Denmark, it has been nobly decreed by the king, that every deaf and dumb person shall receive an education to render him a useful member of society.

An Apology for Political Religion.—An established clergyman once observed to Cobbett—"Your religion, Mr. Cobbett, seems to me to be altogether political." Cobbett replied, "Very much so, indeed; and it well may, since I have been furnished with a creed and liturgy which make *part of an Act of Parliament.*

Difference between Protestantism and Popery.—A gentleman said to a friend, "The difference between Popery and Protestantism is only a paper wall." "Aye," replied the other; "but on that paper wall is written the whole word of God."

Party Spirit unfavourable to the Reception of Truth.—Nothing can be conceived more unfavourable for candid judgment than political or religious dissension. The different parties lose that soundness of understanding and accuracy of moral perception which, in ordinary times, the generality of men happily possess. And whilst they brand their adversaries as proceeding from the worst of motives, hold forth similar actions on the part of themselves, as unequivocal evidence of ardent patriotism, or pure zeal for the interests of religion.—*Cook's History of the Church of Scotland.*

A Sharp Cut at a Soft Head.—A deistical jackanapes, travelling in a stage-coach, attempted to ridicule the Scriptures. Among other topics, he made himself very merry with the

story of David and Goliah, asserting the impossibility of a stripling like David being able to sling a stone with sufficient force to penetrate the giant's forehead. A Quaker, able to contain no longer, sarcastically rejoined—"Indeed, friend, I do not think it at all impossible, especially if the Philistine's *head was as soft as thine.*

Leisure and Laziness—Leisure is time for doing something great and useful. This the active improve, but the lazy sleep away. A life of leisure and a life of laziness are two very different and opposite things.

Content.—Nature is content with little; grace with less; but lust with nothing.

A Moral Monster.—A man with a head full of knowledge and a heart full of lusts, is the most monstrous and miserable wretch on this side perdition.

Bradbury.—At the meeting of Dissenting Ministers, at Salter's Hill, London, in 1718, the Orthodox and the Arian parties divided on the question of subscription or non-subscription to a declaration of the doctrine of the Trinity. Sixty ministers went into the gallery, and subscribed. Fifty remained standing out for non-subscription to creeds. When the subscribers were withdrawing, some persons had the indecency to raise a hiss. This provoked the celebrated Bradbury to retort with his powerful sarcasm—"It is the voice of the serpent, and may be expected against zeal for the seed of the woman."

The Rev John M'Bride was a Presbyterian minister in Belfast, about the year 1700. He was a man of a shrewd and jocular turn, even in the pulpit. Mr. Clugston, the Sovereign, one sabbath, sat in the gallery; and in pulling out his pocket-handkerchief, he pulled out with it a pack of cards, which fell in a shower on the people below. "Hah! Sir," exclaimed Mr. M'Bride from the pulpit, "but your psalm-book is ill bound!"

Riches.—A young person once mentioned to Dr. Franklin his surprise, that the possession of riches should ever be attended with undue solicitude. The Doctor took an apple, and presented it to a child in the room, who could scarcely grasp it in his hand. He then gave it a second, which filled the other hand. Choosing a third, remarkable for its size and beauty, he presented that also. The child, after many ineffectual attempts to hold the three apples, dropt the last, and burst into tears.

"See, there," said the philosopher, "a *little man* with more riches than he can enjoy."

Value of Early Rising.—The difference between rising every morning at six and at eight, in the course of forty years, supposing a man to go to bed at the same time he otherwise would, amounts to 29,000 hours, or 3 years, 121 days, and 16 hours, which will afford eight hours a day for exactly ten years; so that it is the same as if ten years of life were added—a weighty consideration, in which we could command eight hours every day for the cultivation of our minds, or the despatch of business.

Truth Troublesome.—Men that love their vices say, that telling the truth bluntly doth more harm than good, and setteth men by the ears. Men list not to be disturbed in their sins; and when one saith boldly, *Thou* art the man, men say that such an one lacketh in charity, and ought to be shut up as a troubler of the peace, when it is nothing but their sins that do trouble the peace.—*Lattimer.*

Wonders of Chemistry.—Aquafortis, and the air which we breathe, are made of the same materials. Linen and sugar, and spirits of wine, are so much alike in their chemical composition, that an old shirt can be converted into its own weight in sugar, and the sugar into spirits of wine. Water is made of two substances, one of which is the cause of almost all combustion or burning, and the other will burn with more rapidity than almost any thing in nature. The famous Peruvian bark, so much used to strengthen stomachs, and the poisonous principle of opium, are formed of the same materials.

Sailor's Logic.—A merchant, in consulting a ship-master on the choice of a name for a beautiful ship, suggested the name of a distinguished individual. This was objected to by the mariner, who said—"Although the name is very good and popular at present, yet, in the course of a few years, the individual who bears it may turn out to be a scoundrel. Always wait till a man is in his grave before you make so free with his name.

Paul's Heresy.—"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things that are written in the law and in the prophets.*"

So jealous is theological prejudice, that a man can hardly be-

lieve and preach *all* that is in the Bible, without incurring suspicions of heresy. If he preach *obligation* to the full extent of the Bible, he is nicknamed an Arminian; and if he preaches dependence and sovereignty just as it is in the Bible, he is a Calvinist; although the worst that can be truly said of him is, that he has a bad name. Paul's heresy consisted simply in "believing *all* things that are written in the law and the prophets."

Sabbath-school Children.—At a meeting of the London Sunday-school Union, the Rev. S. Kilpin related, that in catechising some children on "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," the following were the answers:—What is to be done? The will of God. Where is it to be done? On earth. How is it to be done? As it is in heaven. How do you think the angels do the will of God in heaven, as they are our pattern? The first replied, "They do it immediately." The second, "They do it actively." The third, "They do it unitedly." Here a pause ensued; after some time a little girl said, "Sir, they do it *without asking any questions.*"

Andrew Fuller.—Fuller was raised up by Providence, for the purpose of throwing a strong light upon the human mind in reference to the great truths of the Gospel. His "Calvinistic and Socinian systems examined and compared as to their moral tendency," is a work of incomparable merit, and has ever since hung like a millstone about the neck of Unitarianism. His "Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation," has done more than any other uninspired production, to rescue the English and American Baptist churches from the suffocating clutches of Antinomianism. His "Gospel its Own Witness," powerfully exposes the absurdities, contradictions, and licentious tendencies of Deism, and exhibits Christianity as occupying the high vantage ground of internal harmony and holy influence.

Cooke, the Miser.—This avaricious character, finding himself near his end, sent for a lawyer to draw up his will. When the man of parchment had concluded, he inquired his charge. The attorney named the sum. Cooke observed, "That is a great deal of money; I cannot spare it now, but you may add a codicil that I bequeath you the amount of the bill." The other agreed, with a proviso that interest should be paid till the day of Cooke's death. This event took place within a week afterwards. The attorney mischievously observed, "He was sure he died so soon, on purpose to chouse him out of the interest!"

LUTHER.

REVIEW OF THE REV. JAMES MORGAN'S DISCOURSE ON EDUCATION.

We shall but do justice to this sermon, to the author, and to our readers, by presenting an analysis of its contents. The text is—"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." The introduction is founded on the fact, that the public mind, through the discussions of late years, now decidedly owns the importance of universal education. That education should be connected with religious training, is the leading doctrine of the discourse. The Sermon is divided into two parts. The first explains what is implied in "training up a child in the way he should go;" and the second enforces the duty, from the promise annexed—"When he is old, he will not depart from it."

I.—Training includes—

1. The enlightenment of the understanding. The ordinary branches, reading, writing, and arithmetic, should be taught, and taught not merely as mechanical operations, but as intellectual exercises. The elements of school instruction should include history, geography, and natural history. Intellectual training should comprehend eternal concerns. Man is destined for another world; and to train him aright, he must be educated for both. The Word of God is the instrument of training. To this it is admirably adapted. The subjects of which it treats are the greatest and most important possible. The manner in which it treats them is best suited to youth, being simple, attractive, and exhibiting principles in the actions of living men. The very style of the Bible; its simplicity, beauty, and sublimity; its history, poetry, argumentation, and eloquence, fit it for being a book of education.

2. The government of the temper. The teacher should not educate by the principle of terror; this causes hatred and duplicity. Emulation ought not to be employed; this produces suspicion, jealousy, mortification, or triumph and revenge. Improper books, however classic, are to be excluded, as no intellectual eminence will justify what corrupts the heart of youth. Evil passions are to be subdued. Good affections are to be cultivated. Self-government is to be acquired. The foundation of self-government is to be laid in the new birth. The rule, is the Spirit dwelling in the heart. The exemplification of the good affections—meekness, patience, courage, devotion—are set forth in the word of God.

3. The formation of good habits. Habits formed early establish the character for life. Youth are to be trained to habits of Order, Punctuality, Diligence, Civility, Truth, Forgiveness, Benevolence. It is not enough that these habits should be inculcated as lessons—the guardians of youth should see them practised.

II.—The duty is enforced by the promise annexed. The command and the promise are connected by the law of Habit, by the Influence of social intercourse, and by the promised Blessing of God. In the education of youth, we should labour with Prayer and in Hope. The Benefits resulting from training youth on these principles are—

1. The formation of character. A child is to be trained for the duties of this life and the enjoyments of the next. Contrast the habits of a youth trained on evil principles with those of a youth trained on good principles, in relation to Duties, Pleasures, Trials, Prosperity.

2. Family religion. God is worshipped. Children are trained. Servants participate. The benefits of family training descend to future generations. The Spirit of God is promised to the seed of the pious. Some of the greatest men in the American Church are the descendants of Edwards. The Wardlaws and the Browns of Scotland are the posterity of the Browns and Erskines of the olden time. The spirit of the Henrys still lives in the churches of England.

3. The revival and extension of religion of the church. The church acts on the family; the family is the nursery of the church. Parents improve in religion by training their children; the children become members of the church. The church improves, and starts afresh on a new course of prosperity. The son not only inherits the blessing, but improves upon the father. Godliness advances with accelerated motion. Bible classes and Sabbath schools now tell in the vigorous efforts and multiplying churches of the present day. In ten years, the Synod of Ulster has erected more than eighty congregations. Let such education be universal, and the church will become a praise in the earth.

4. National prosperity. Godliness is the glory of a nation. Look at the difference between the same soil sown with good and bad seed. In a scriptural education, we have the elements of national prosperity and greatness. Peace, industry, honesty, justice, sobriety, health, riches, honour, and power, are its fruits.

The Sermon concludes with an address to those who have the direction of youth. Parents, Masters, Teachers, the Church, and the Government, are separately urged rightly to educate. Did these parties act with faithfulness, peace and plenty, uprightness of character, domestic piety, revived religion, and public prosperity, would pervade the land.

The doctrine of this discourse is sound; the matter is good; the materials are abundant and various; the illustration is apt and pleasing. Altogether, it is a sermon of much excellence.

It was preached with the view of having a school-house erected, in connexion with the author's congregation in Belfast. Every congregation should have not only their Sabbath-school, but their day-school. Let ministers, elders, and churches set about this without delay, and let them do it with their might. In the first Number of the *Christian Freeman*, under the heading, "Congregational Improvements," we suggested and enforced this. We claim the priority of the project. The article alluded to did good at the time. Some acted on the idea. Little more than a year ago, the Synod of Ulster formed a plan for congregational schools. They have also directed the formation of congregational Sabbath-schools. We would have all churches do the same. Let them have a system of general management, and let them carry this system into universal operation.

Clear and correct as this discourse is, we have noticed some mistakes. After speaking, page 4, of the diversity of opinion that exists as to what the religious training of the young should be—a diversity which, the author observes, must continue till all shall see eye to eye on the great principles of faith and practice—he says, "In the meantime it is the duty and privilege of every class to strive to the utmost to promote and establish those views of education which they consider to be most conducive to the public good. Unless we misapprehend Mr. Morgan's meaning here, we cannot agree with him in this sentiment. Is it indeed the duty—the duty which God requires, of every class to

promote what *they consider* the most useful views of education? Then it is the duty, and duty is a thing which God requires, of the Roman Catholic to promote his Popish views of education. It is the duty, God requires, of the Arian to promote his Arian views of education. God requires the Arminian to promote his Arminian views of education. Each of these classes may consider it to be their duty. But what duty is, and what they may *consider* duty, are very different things. Whatever various classes may consider, God cannot require the inculcation of contradictory systems of religion. He requires that the truth only be taught, and no other teaching is duty. Mr. Morgan, we are sure, thinks so, as well as we.

Speaking of the Presbyterian Church, p. 5, Mr. Morgan observes, "The school-master, with the Bible in his hand, and its truth in his heart, has ever been accounted the indispensable companion and fellow-labourer of the pastor. And, when such has not actually existed, so far the church has not been formed on its original model." There seems a sort of contradiction here. The school-master here described, he says, has ever been accounted the "*indispensable fellow-labourer* of the pastor;" and yet, he immediately adds, "When such has not *actually* existed." The school-master, with the *truth* of the Bible in his *heart*, as well as the Bible in his hand, has *ever* been *accounted* the *indispensable fellow-labourer* of the pastor. Is this the fact? By some, doubtless, it was always so accounted; but, at times, not so by the generality. There were times when many felt indifferent with regard to this qualification, not only in the schoolmaster, but in the pastor himself. Beyond all doubt, both ought to be so distinguished.

Mr. Morgan, p. 5, speaking of himself as a Presbyterian, remarks, "Our church, from the beginning of her history, has been associated, beyond any other, with education." What church does Mr. Morgan mean here by "*our* church?" What church did his hearers understand him to mean? Does he take in the whole Presbyterian church of different sections and synods, throughout the world? Or does he mean, by "our church," the Synod of Ulster, as compared with other churches and other Presbyterian bodies, in this country? If this last be the case, we are prepared to assert, on behalf of *other Presbyterian churches*, an attention to religious and general education, not inferior to any.

These strictures, we would not have been at the pains to make, had we not considered the sermon a good one.

LUTHER.

PERSEVERANCE.

TAMERLANE the Great was remarkable for his *perseverance*. No difficulties led him to give up what he had once undertaken, and he often persisted in his efforts, under such circumstances as led all around him to despair. He used, on such occasions, to relate to his friends an anecdote of his early life. "I once," said he, "was forced to take shelter from my enemies in a ruined building, where I sat alone for many hours. Desiring to divert my mind from my hopeless condition, I fixed my observation on a little ant that was carrying a grain of corn, larger than itself, up a high wall. I numbered the efforts it made to accomplish this object. The grain fell *sixty-nine*

times to the ground, but the insect *persevered*, and the *seventieth* time it reached the top of the wall. "This sight," said Timour, "gave me courage at the moment, and I have never forgotten the lesson it conveyed."

CROSSGAR, NEAR COLERAIN.

THE Presbyterian Secession congregation of Crossgar have done themselves much credit by the erection of a very neat and comfortable house of worship. Since the building of the old house, many alterations and improvements had been introduced into the dwellings of the people forming the congregation; but, until recently, they did not somehow think of increasing the commodiousness and respectability of the house of God. During the last autumn, however, arrangements were adopted for removing this reproach; and so vigorously were they carried into effect, that before Christmas, the work was completed. At the opening of the house, an excellent sermon was preached by the Rev. William Wilson, Dunbo, to a numerous and attentive audience, and a handsome collection taken, to aid in defraying the expense. The spirited exertions of the Crossgar congregation, and of their pastor, the Rev. Mr. Wilson, were assisted by several friends of other denominations, who kindly and munificently presented their contributions. Among these may be noticed particularly a subscription of £10, by the Rev. Thomas Richardson, rector of the parish; and of £5 each, by Sir Robert Bateson, Bart., and Theobald Jones, Esq., Members of Parliament for the county. Mr. Wilson, of Drumcroon, Mr. Bennet, of Greenfield, and others in connexion with the Synod of Ulster, afforded substantial proofs of their approval of the undertaking; nor are the people of Crossgar less indebted to several of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and particularly to Mr. Alexander Cathcart, Curragh, who not only subscribed liberally, but, with unwearied zeal and activity, exerted himself in raising subscriptions.

May the Secession congregation of Crossgar, with their minister, abundantly profit by divine ordinances in the house which they have erected for the worship of the God of their fathers.

INSTALLATION.

On the 28th of January, the Rev. J. P. Dickey, formerly pastor of Bethel Secession congregation, Pennsylvania, America, was installed, as colleague and successor to his father, in the congregation of Carnone. The morning sermon was preached by the Rev. J. Armstrong, Castlederg. The Rev. John Martin, Newtownstewart, explained and defended Presbyterian Ordination. Rev. John Leckey, Raphoe, proposed the proper questions to the young minister, offered up the installation prayer, and solemnly charged both pastor and people to fulfil their respective duties. Although the day was very severe, a large and respectable congregation attended, and evinced deep interest in the solemn services.

Wilson, Printer, Belfast.